A

REPLY

TO A

PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED THE

BISHOP of Cork's Paſtoral

LETTER

ANSWERED &c.

CORKE Printed by *M. Pilkington* in *Caſtle-ſtreet.*

BRITISH MUSEUM

A

REPLY &c.

THE Biſhop of Corke, having ſeen a Pamphlet Entitled, *The Biſhop of Cork's Paſtoral Letter Anſwer'd* &c. thinks proper to inform the Public, that the Author of this Pamphlet ſets out upon a very wrong Foundation, when he aſſerts, that the Refutation *of a Work Entitled, a Brief Hiſtorical Account of the Vaudois &c. is what the Author of the Paſtoral Letter took in Hand*; Becauſe the Biſhop ſolemnly declares, he never ſaw that Work, Entitled *a Brief Hiſtorical Account of the Vaudois*, &c. till ſome Time after he had publiſhed his Paſtoral Letter; and appeals to the Mayor of Corke, whether or no the Paper which he ſent to the Biſhop, was not Entitled, *the Occaſion and Subject of a Piece of Work now out of the Preſs* &c. dated *Jan.* 22. 1742-3; & was only the ſize of half a Sheet of Paper Printed on one ſide. For had the Biſhop's Letter been

intended as an Anſwer to the Work now mentioned, he would have called it a *Book*, or a *Treatiſe*, or a *Pamphlet*, and not a *Paper*, as he ſtiles it in the Beginning of his Letter.

And as the Biſhop had no Deſign, or Deſire of entering into needleſs Diſputes, he ſelected out the moſt material parts of that Paper for the Subject of his remarks; and indeed the only material Parts with Regard to the Proteſtants of this Kingdom: For he apprehends, that if he can ſhew, that the Proteſtant Church of *Ireland* agrees in its Principles with the Doctrine publiſhed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, he has nothing to do with the *Vaudois* or *Albigeois*, but leaves them to Defend themſelves and their Tenets.

Nor does he apprehend that he is obliged to ſhew the gradual Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*; * *when did the Change happen? Who were the firſt and principal Authors of it? Where did Popery make its firſt Entrance?* &c. &c. as this Author requires him to do. Becauſe, though it might not be very difficult to be done; it would yet be tedious; and involve this Controverſy in Hiſtorical Diſputes, fit only for the Peruſal of the Learned. But to make uſe of this Author's own Similitude, ſuppoſe an *Upſtart* Challenges a right to an Eſtate, which has been long in the Poſſeſſion of another Perſon; If this *Upſtart* has nothing elſe but *Tradition*, but *Fables*, and *Calumnies* to ſupport his claim, God forbid, that the Poſſeſſor ſhould be turned out from his Eſtate: but if upon producing the *Title Deeds*, it appears plainly that this Eſtate belonged originaly to him; no Court of Juſtice would oblige him to prove, when it was, that ſuch or ſuch a Ditch was made by

* p. 8—

by the *Uſurper* in poſſeſſion; or ſuch a *Houſe* built; or ſuch a *Tree* planted; or ſuch a *Boundary* removed; which altered the face, and changed the appearance of the Eſtate. The Queſtion, among Perſons who had a mind to arrive at Truth, would be, Whether the *Deed* produced be Genuine? And whether the *Eſtate* claimed agrees with the Deſcription given of its bounds in the original Deed? And if he can prove theſe facts, I apprehend this *Upſtart*, as he is called by our Author, would be decreed to his original *Eſtate*.

THE *Title Deeds*, which the *Proteſtants* produce, are the *Scriptures* of the new Teſtament, which it is hoped this Author will not deny to be * *Authentic Records*: The words of which were literaly quoted by the Biſhop in order to prove, with regard to the Doctrines of *Tranſubſtantiation*, the *Supremacy of the Pope*, the *Celibacy of the Clergy*, *Prayers in an unknown Tongue*, *and Communion in one kind*; That the practice of the *Proteſtant* Church of *Ireland* agrees exactly with the Rules preſcribed in the *Scriptures* of the new Teſtament. And therefore he thinks it follows of conſequence, that *Proteſtantism* is ſo far *a part of the Chriſtian Religion*. Which was the *Eſtate* in diſpute.

THE ſame proofs likewiſe ſerved to ſhew, that the Doctrines profeſſed by the *Proteſtants* were the ſame with thoſe preſcribed by our Saviour, and recommended by St. *Paul*. And he thinks two ſuch Examples as thoſe to be better Precedents for the Proof of there having been *Proteſtants* before *Luther* and *Calvin*, than either the *Vaudois* or *Albigeois*, or any other Inſtances that could poſſibly be produced. With

* p. 6. 7.

With regard to *the Supremacy of the Pope*, the Biſhop quoted thoſe paſſages mentioned in St. *Paul's* Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, where he ſays, that *he reſiſted Peter to his Face*, and that *Peter was reprehenſible*; in order to prove, that St. *Paul* did not acknowledge any ſupremacy in St. *Peter*, and of conſequence that he would leſs acknowledge it, if now living, in any of his Succeſſors. And it is with great concern the Biſhop hears any Chriſtian, of what denomination ſoever, attempt apologizing for the ſupremacy of St. *Peter*, by ſuppoſing this *Reprimand* to have been a *Colluſion* between the two Apoſtles; and that this was ſaid, † *very probably with Peter's own conſent, the better to perſwade the Galatians.* Let ſuch a low Artifice be to the ſhame of its Profeſſors, but far be it from the Dignity, and Simplicity of the Apoſtles of Chriſt.

WITH regard to *the Celibacy of the Clergy*, the Biſhop produced two Texts out of St. *Paul's* Epiſtle to *Timothy*, wherein he permits both *Biſhops* and *Deacons* to be each of them * *the Huſband of one Wife.* In Anſwer to which, this Author ſays, ‡ that as *Timothy could not meet with any Man having more than one Wife, ſince the Plurality of Wives was not allowed under the Goſpel*; Therefore this muſt mean *a Widower, who had been Married but once.* But this Author might have recollected, that the firſt Converts to Chriſtianity were Originaly either *Jews* or *Heathens*, and that a *Plurality of Wives* was allowed by both of them: That our Saviour finds Fault with the Jews for Divorcing their Wives upon trivial occaſions, and taking other Wives in their Room; and that he chargeth ſuch with living in ‖ *Adultery.* And for this Reaſon it is, that St. *Paul* cautions *Timothy* againſt admitting

† P. 16. * 1. Tim. iii. 2, 12. ‡ P. 18. ‖ Mat. v. 32. Mark. x. 11.

admitting perſons of ſuch a Light and wanton Diſpoſition of Mind, into the Offices of the Chriſtian Miniſtry. But what ſhews this Author's ſuppoſition to be abſolutely without foundation is, that St. *Paul*, in this very Chapter, does not only Deſcribe what ſort of Men theſe *Huſbands* ought to be; but at the ſame Time characteriſes their † *Wives* alſo, and directs them how they ought to regulate their Children and their Houſes: Which does by no means agree with the ſuppoſition of their being *Widowers*.

WITH regard to *Prayers in an unknown Tongue*, the Biſhop produced a quotation out of St. *Paul's* Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, ‡ wherein he plainly prohibits it. In Anſwer to which this * Author boldly aſſerts that St. *Paul's* advice is *Alone* directed againſt having *Exhortations* and *Inſtructions* in an unknown Tongue: Whereas nothing can be more certain, than the direct contrary of this; and that he abſolutely mentions *Prayer*, and pronounces it † *unfruitfull*, if it be performed *in an unknown Tongue*.

BUT ſuppoſe, to preſerve this Author's diſtinction, we ſhould allow even in the Celebration of the ‖ *Maſs*, that it was not neceſſary for the common People to underſtand the words in the Conſecration of the Sacrament: yet are there not ſome prayers in that Office, which were originaly deſigned for the Congregation to join in? And if theſe are ſaid by the Prieſt in a Language unknown to the Vulgar, how ſhall they *ſay Amen*, as St. *Paul* Expreſseth it?

BUT ſays this Author, it is neceſſary that theſe Things ſhould be in an unknown Tongue, † *to keep the Doctrine concerning thoſe Myſteries, clear from Alterations, and Errors.* Why then are they not in *Syriack* or *Greek* in which

†. 1. Tim. iii. 4, 11, 12. ‡ 1. Cor. xiv, 2, &c. * P. 20. † 1. Cor. xiv. 14. ‖ P. 19. † P. 21.

which they were originaly delivered? And though it may be granted, that there is ſome *Myſtery* in praying to the *Virgin Mary*, yet ſurely there is no *Myſtery* in Praying to God! If then it be aſked, why is the Lord's Prayer uſed at *Maſs* in an unknown Tongue? This Author has his Reply ready at hand, for ſays he, the Latin Tongue is not an unknown Tongue, ſince there are multitudes of People able to Interpret it, & St. *Paul* prohibits only a † *Language abſolutely unknown*. This Expreſſion of a *Language abſolutely unknown* the Biſhop takes to be abſolute Nonſence; but he ſuppoſes this Author means a Language, which few People ſpeak or underſtand. But to him, who does not underſtand *Latin*, even that Language is as *abſolutely unknown* as Gibberiſh or any Language that, if poſſible, is *abſolutely unknown*.

As to the Doctrine of *Communion in one Kind*, the Biſhop quoted a Text out of the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, wherein St. *Paul* requires the *Cup* to be received as well as the *Bread*; to which this Author Replies, ‡ by finding fault with the *Rhemiſh* Tranſlation of the *Bible*, for omiting the Disjunctive Particle OR, and inſerting the Copulative particle AND. The Biſhop joyns with him indeed in thinking that Tranſlation, which was made in the Popiſh Seminary at *Rheims*, a very bad one; but in this place, the miſtake of the Tranſlators happens to be of no very great conſequence in this Debate, as will appear by an exact and true Tranſlation of the words of St. *Paul*, which is; *For as often as ye eat this Bread AND drink this Cup, ye do ſhew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whoſoever ſhall eat this Bread OR drink the Cup of the Lord unworthily, ſhall be gu ilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. But let*

a

† P. 21. ‡ P. 24.

a Man prove (or examine) himſelf, and ſo let him eat of the Bread, AND *Drink of the Cup*, &c. Where it is to be obſerved, that the disjunctive Particle OR is only put to the *unworthy receiver*; who certainly may be criminal *either* in eating of the *Bread*, OR in drinking of the *Cup unworthily*. But he, that proveth, or examineth himſelf, and is deſirous to *ſhew forth the Lord's Death* until his coming again, is commanded both to *eat of the Bread*, AND *drink of the Cup*.

THIS Author beſides refers his †Reader to the Original Inſtitution of this Sacrament, as mentioned by St. *Mathew*; and unfortunately for him, it is to be obſerved, that according to St. *Mathew*, when our Saviour Inſtituted this Sacrament, he particularly inſerted the word ALL, when he commanded his Diſciples to drink of the *Cup*, ſaying, * *Drink ye* ALL *of it*, though when he gave them the *Bread*, he ſaid only, *take*, *Eat*. And St. *Mark*, in like manner, when he mentions this Inſtitution, though he does not ſpecify that all eat of the *Bread*, yet poſitively ſays, that they ALL *drank* of the *Cup*. Now, as *thoſe things were not written for their ſakes alone, but for our's alſo*, it manifeſtly appears, that if the Suppreſſing of either of theſe Elements could poſſibly be vindicated, it muſt be that of the *Bread*, much rather than that of the *Cup*.

WITH regard to the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, the Biſhop only referred in his Letter to the abovementioned Paſſage, which he thinks ſufficient to convince any unprejudiced Perſon of the Inconſiſtency of that Doctrine with the Sentiments of St. *Paul*; who, *Three times* in that Paſſage, calls the Element of *Bread* after Conſecration by

C. the

† P. 23. * Mat. 26, 27. Mar. 14. 23.

the plain name of *Bread*. To which our Author Anſwers, † *And ſo does the Biſhop of Rome, and ſo do all Biſhops and Prieſts in Communion with him* — * *But what Bread? The Bread of Life*; &c. What Bread it is that the Biſhop of Rome means, the Biſhop of Corke does not pretend to ſay; But ſure he is, that in the Quotation before us, St. *Paul* meant only *plain Bread*, and not the *Bread of Life*; Becauſe he ſuppoſes the *Unworthy Receiver* to eat of it, as well as the *Worthy*; and it is preſumed, that this Author will not inſiſt upon it, that an *Unworthy Receiver* eateth *the Bread of Life*.

And now the Biſhop hopes, that this Author is convinced, it was not with a deſire of ſhifting the Argument, that he added a *Poſtſcript* to his Letter, concerning the Idolatrous practice of *Image-worſhip*, and the Infamous and Impious Cuſtom of granting *Indulgences* practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, as this Author would ſuggeſt. But the Biſhop cannot help taking notice at preſent, though the *Paper*, in Anſwer to which his *Paſtoral Letter* was intended, was Printed *Jan.* 22d. and that his *Letter* was not Written till the 28th of *March* following, that during all that Time, he never ſaw the *Treatiſe* now mentioned by this Author, nor heard of it's having been diſtributed abroad; but as ſoon as the Biſhop's *Letter* was Publiſhed, then the former *Paper* was ſuppreſſed, and the other much larger *Treatiſe* was ſent abroad in its Room— It is a weak Cauſe indeed, that ſtands in need of ſuch an Artifice to Defend it!

The Biſhop likewiſe thinks it proper to inform this Author, that there are ſeveral Faults in his Performance, not only with regard to the Language, but alſo with Regard to

† P. 24. * P. 25.

to the Argument, which are not worthy of his Notice, ſo as to be particularly ſpecified; but he imagines, that the following Articles, though not abſolutely material, may deſerve ſome Animadverſions.

In the 11th Page this Author aſſerts, that St. *Peter* had been at *Rome* 13 Years before the Time of St. *Paul's* Writing his Epiſtle to the *Romans*; whereas, the Biſhop thinks it is almoſt demonſtrable from that † Epiſtle, that neither St. *Peter*, nor any other *Apoſtle* had ever been in *Rome* at, or before the Time of St. *Paul's* Writing that Epiſtle. For though the *Faith* of the *Romans* had been *much ſpoken of*; this might have been propagated by a *Diſciple*, and not by an *Apoſtle*, as the Caſe actualy happened both in * *Samaria*, and at ‡ *Antioch*. And it appears from St. *Paul's* Epiſtle to the ‖ *Galatians* that, if St. *Peter* ever was at *Rome*, he was only the Apoſtle of the *Circumciſion*, or the Apoſtle of the *Jews*; but that *Paul* was the Apoſtle of the *Uncircumciſion*, or the Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*. For ſays St. *Paul*, *the Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion was committed unto me, as the Goſpel of the Circumciſion was unto Peter. For he that wrought effectualy in Peter to the Apoſtleſhip of the Circumciſion, the ſame was mighty in me towards the Gentiles.* And hence it is, That he frequently Stiles himſelf, and particularly in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, † *the Apoſtle of the Gentiles. For I ſpeak to you Gentiles, in as much as I am the Apoſtle of the Gentiles.* And again he ſays, ‖ *Nevertheleſs, Brethren I have Written the more boldly to you, in ſome ſort, as puting you in mind, becauſe of the Grace that is given to me of God, that I ſhould be the Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt to the Gentiles.*

In

† See Rom. xv. 19-24. * Acts. viii. 14. ‡ Acts. xi. 19, 20. ‖ Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9. † Rom. xi. 13. ‖ Rom. xv. 15, 16.

In Page 14th this Author is likewiſe miſtaken in his aſſertion, that St. *Peter preſided* in the Council held at *Jeruſalem*, as mentioned Acts 15. St. *Peter* indeed ſpoke in that Aſſembly, † *after there had been much Diſputing*; but it was St. *James*, the then Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who *Preſided*, and put an End to the Debate, by ‖ declaring it as *his Sentence, that they ſhould not trouble thoſe, which, from among the Gentiles, were turned unto God* &c.

Now I defy all Mankind to produce any one Inſtance, wherein St. *Peter* ever Exerciſed his pretended Supremacy: And yet here is a manifeſt Inſtance of the Supremacy of St. *James*. And it is further remarkable, that, when St. *Paul* names the Apoſtles together, he Places *James* before *Peter*; which he never would have done, had the Supremacy of St. *Peter* been then acknowledged: Thus, when St. *Paul* went up to *Jeruſalem* by Revelation, & communicated privately to them who were of Reputation, that *Goſpel*, which he preached among the *Gentiles*, he mentions *James*, & *Peter*, & *John*, as thoſe Perſons who *gave unto him, and Barnabas the Right Hands of Fellowſhip, that they*, PAUL & BARNABAS, *ſhould go unto the Heathen, & they*, i. e. JAMES, & PETER, & JOHN *unto the Circumciſion*. (Gal. ii. 2, 9.) And the laſt Time of his going to *Jeruſalem*, as mentioned in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, St. *Luke* ſays, * *and the Day following, Paul went in with us unto* JAMES, *and all the Elders were preſent*. Whence it appears, that it was *James* who again *Preſided* in this Aſſembly, wherein *Paul* is directed to go and *purify himſelf*; with which Determination *Paul* complied; and yet we hear no Concluſions deduced from thence of the Supremacy of St. *James*: Whereas, if St. *Peter*

† Acts xv. 7. ‖ Acts xv. 13 -- 19. * Acts xxi, 18.

Peter had happened to have *Preſided*, which he might poſſibly have done in the abſence of St. *James*, what a flagrant Inſtance would this have been reckoned of his Supremacy? Or could there be found in the Epiſtles of St. *Peter*, any Expreſſions, equivalent to what St. *Paul* ſays of himſelf, that ‡ *the care of* ALL *the Churches cometh upon him daily*: And that * *ſo he Ordained in* ALL *Churches*; What an Handle would have been taken from thence for aſſerting the Supremacy of St. *Peter?*

In a Word, let this Author ſhew one Text of Scripture in the *new Teſtament*, where there is any Superiority, or Power *actualy* given to St. *Peter*, that was not *actualy* given at the ſame Time, to the reſt of the Apoſtles, and I will give up the Point. For though Chriſt, while upon Earth, before his Death, *promiſed* that he would † *give the Keys of his Kingdom to* St. *Peter*, yet I do affirm, that after his Reſurrection, when he did give them, he ‖ gave them at the ſame Time alſo to the reſt of the Apoſtles.

In Page 17th this Author Aſſerts, *that no Woman was ever allowed to have more than one Huſband at once, even when Men were* SUFFERED BY THE LAW OF MOSES *to have ſeveral Wives together.* Whereas, the Biſhop cannot find, that, by the *Law of Moſes* a Man was ever *ſuffered* to have more than one Wife at a Time, except in the caſe of *Adultery*: Upon which occaſion, it was permitted to the Huſband, when he § *found ſome Uncleaneſs*, or Nakedneſs *in his Wife*, as the Original Word denotes, *to Write her a Bill of Divorcement, and ſend her out of his Houſe*; and our Saviour ſays, it was ‡ *becauſe of the hardneſs of their Hearts*, that even in ſuch a Caſe, *Moſes* permitted them to take other Wives. But indeed the

‡ 2 Cor. xi. 28. * 1 Cor. vii. 17. † Mat. xvi. 19 ‖ John, xx. 19-23. § Deut. xxiv. 1. ‡ Mat. xix. 8.

Scribes, who had rendered *the Commandments of God of none effect by their* TRADITIONS, in order to make *Gain* to themſelves by ſelling theſe *Indulgences*, had given encouragement to Divorces upon very ſlight and trivial occaſions, which came in Time to be frequently practiſed; but were *never ſuffered by the Law of Moſes*. And in like manner it was uſual for the Women alſo, though never *allowed* under the *Moſaic* Diſpenſation, to write a *Bill of Divorce*, and diſcharge their Huſbands, and marry others during the Life-time of the firſt. For proof of which, I need only refer this Author to * *Joſephus*, who declares poſitively, that *Salome*, the Wife of *Coſtobarus*, having quarreled with her Huſband, ſent him a *Bill of Divorce*, and Diſſolved her Marriage with him. He likewiſe mentions, that the famous *Herodias*, who is taken Notice of in the ‡ Goſpels, was not only criminal, in Marrying two Brothers, but alſo in Marrying two Brothers who were both alive at the ſame Time; and poſitively † ſays, that ſhe Divorced herſelf from her former Huſband *Herod-Philip*, and was Married to *Herod-Antipas*, the Brother of her former Huſband, while he was yet alive. And our Saviour's Declaration, that § *if a Woman ſhall put away her Huſband, and be Married to another, ſhe committeth Adultery*, ſhews plainly, what was the practice of the Times. So that, when St. *Paul* Commands *Timothy*, not to let a *Widow* be put upon the Charitable Liſt, *under Threeſcore Years, having been the Wife of one Man*, it is plain, he alludes to the Wicked practice above mentioned.

In Page 27th, in Anſwer to what the Biſhop of Corke had mentioned, with regard to a Pamphlet Publiſhed by Biſhop *Uſher*, when Primate of *Ireland*, Entitled, *the Religion*

* Joſ. Ant. Lib. xv. C. 7. ‡ Mat. xiv. 3. Mar. vi. 17. † Joſ. Ant. Lib. xviii. C. 5. § Mar. x. 12.

ligion, profeſſed by the Antient Iriſh, demonſtrated to be the ſame in ſubſtance, with that, which is now eſtabliſhed by the Public Authority, in Ireland. This Author ‡ ſays, *but where are thoſe his Demonſtrations? Why are they not inſerted, and given to the Public?* In return to which it may be ſaid, was there ever ſuch an Evaſion? Did ever a Man of Learning ask ſuch a Queſtion before? Or expect ſo unreaſonable a Thing? The Biſhop of Corke quoted a Printed Book; a Book that was Printed, and Publiſhed in the Life-time of *Biſhop Uſher*; and has ſince been re-printed in *Dublin*, about Three or Four Years ago: And this Author wants him to have inſerted it in his *Paſtoral Letter*. If every Book, which an Author quotes, was to be *inſerted* in the Argument, that it is quoted to ſupport, there would ſoon be an End of all Controverſy among Men of Learning.

INDEED, if we would but Read the H. Scriptures with Attention, and Humility of Mind; and if they eſpecialy, whoſe Buſineſs it is to Inſtruct others, would endeavour after a competent Knowledge of thoſe * *Lively Oracles* in the Original Tongues, in which they were firſt delivered; It would be leſs neceſſary to conſult other Books in our Religious Differences. Not but that Primitive as well as Modern Writers are of excellent ſervice, when they are occaſionaly made uſe of as helps to our Knowledge: But where it is declared criminal for the *Laity* by any means to be intruſted with the *Bible*; and the Voluminous Writings of the *Fathers* and *Schoolmen* are obtruded upon the common People, as if they had the ſame Weight, and Authority with the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament; when Quotations are brought from them, with no other Intention, than to amuſe and perplex the ignorant

‡ P. 27. * Acts 7. 38.

rant and unwary; it is no wonder, that Superſtition and Corruptions ſhould abound, and Diſputes be endleſs. And therefore, as the conſtant appeal *of Old* was † *to the Law and to the Teſtimony*; ſo the Biſhop is fully perſwaded, that *Now* the ſureſt, as well as the ſhorteſt method of determining all Religious Diſputes, would be to apply immediately and directly to the Original Writings, that are left us by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

He cannot however cloſe this Reply, without obſerving likewiſe, that his writing to his *Clergy*, to be *upon the Watch*, and *upon their Guard* againſt the Artifices of the *Church of Rome, that the Enemy may have no advantage over us*, is treated by this Author, as an Invaſion of § *the Law of nature*, as well as of *the Law of the Land*. That Paragraph, which it ſeems has given ſo much offence, is particularly directed by the Biſhop to his *Brethren of the Clergy*: And therefore he hopes, that he has only acquitted himſelf of his Duty, in calling upon thoſe *Clergymen*, the *overſeeing* of whom is committed to his charge by God and the King, to be upon the *Watch*; when Printed Papers are diſperſed, which manifeſtly tend to diſturb the minds, and pervert the Principles of the lower ſort of People: And he cannot conceive, that this will be thought acting againſt *the Laws of the Land* by any Perſon, who is not perſwaded, that all the Laws, made by the late King *James* in favour of *Popery*, are ſtill in Force; and that all the Laws ſince made, in favour of the *Proteſtant Religion*, and the *Proteſtant Succeſſion* in the Houſe of *Hanover*, are null and void.

But ‡ ſays this Author, *what Connexion is there between an Hiſtorical Account of the Vaudois, and the approach or apprehenſion of a War with France?* None indeed

† Iſ. viii. 20. § P. 29. ‡ P. 30.

deed at all: And if theſe Authors, who are concerned in publiſhing anſwers to the Hiſtory of the *Vaudois*, had confined themſelves to *an Hiſtorical account of the Vaudois*, they would have met with no diſturbance from the Biſhop. It is now above fifty Years, ſince a Tranſlation of the Hiſtory of the *Vaudois* was firſt publiſhed in *England*; & under pretence of writing an Anſwer to that Book, ſeditious Papers are *at this time* publiſhed, aſſerting, not that the Religion of the *Vaudois*, but, that *Proteſtancy* in general, *is no part of the Chriſtian Religion.* The *Proteſtant Religion* is the Eſtabliſhed Religion of this Country, and whoever attempts to diſturb the minds of the People, and pervert them from *Proteſtancy* to *Popery*, is an Enemy to the *Eſtabliſhment*, both in Church and State; and makes *an Attack* upon the preſent Conſtitution, which, in the *Church*, has been manifeſtly founded upon *Proteſtancy* ever ſince the Reformation, and in the *State*, ever ſince the Revolution.

THE Author of the Anſwer to the Biſhop's Letter § acknowledges, that the *Papiſts* here in *Ireland* ought only to be on the *Defenſive, and not to Attack.* The Biſhop is therefore deſirous to know, why they did *Attack?* And why at *this Time?* For he did not write his *Paſtoral Letter*, till they had begun the *Attack*, by diſperſing Printed controverſial Papers in his Dioceſe; and therefore he thinks himſelf juſtified in the remark he then made, and which he now repeats, *That it is no hard matter to gueſs at the Reaſon, why the Pope's Emiſſaries ſhould be more active at preſent than uſual; why thoſe Perſons, whoſe Harveſt is likely to be moſt plentiful in a Time of Confuſion and Hurry, ſhould take their Sickles into their Hands*

§ P. 28-29.

at the Approach, or Apprehenſion of a War with France. And if he had inſerted this paſſage in that Paragraph of his *Paſtoral Letter*, which is directed to the *Laity*, inſtead of that which is addreſſed to the *Clergy*, and had realy called aloud for the aſſiſtance of the *Temporal Sword*, to ſtop the Mouths of ſuch *Gainſayers*, what Right has any Member of the Church of *Rome* to find fault with this? *Nec Lex eſt juſtior ulla quam necis Artifices arte perire ſua*, is an Old, and an Equitable Maxim. Suppoſe a *Proteſtant* ſhould Publiſh a Paper in *Rome*, declaring that *Popery was no part of the Chriſtian Religion*; would the *Biſhop of Rome* ſit down to write him a ſerious and a mild Anſwer? Or would he not rather Anſwer him with *Fire* and with *Faggot*?

Do not the *Tenets* of the Church of *Rome* uphold a Court of *Inquiſition*? And what is ſtill worſe, have not the Popes of *Rome* granted *Indulgences*, and given encouragement to the moſt *Bloody* and *Inhuman Murders*, that ever were perpetrated upon the Face of the Earth? Was not the *Maſſacre* of *Paris*, and that *Bloody Rebellion* in this Country, for the Deliverance from which we now annualy Celebrate the 23d. Day of *October*, promoted and executed by the Connivance and Aſſiſtance of * *Jeſuits, Friers, Seminary Prieſts, and other ſuperſtitious Orders of the Popiſh Clergy, under the pretence of a Zeal for Religion*? *Wherein many thouſand Proteſtants were Maſſacred, and many Thouſands of others of them afflicted and tormented with the moſt exquiſite torments that malice could ſuggeſt*? And ſhall a Member of this *Sanguinary Church* preſume to find fault with a *Proteſtant Biſhop, in a Proteſtant Country*, in his own *Dioceſe*, and inſult

* Act of Parliament for celebrating the 23d. of *October*.

inſult him as an Infringer upon *the Laws of Nature*, as well as *the Laws of the Land*, only for writing to his *Clergy* to be * *upon the Watch*, at a Time, when we had reaſon to be apprehenſive of Invaſions from abroad, by a Potent and a *Popiſh* Neighbouring Prince? Can Inſolence riſe Higher? It has indeed pleaſed the Almighty, ſince the Time of the Writing that *Paſtoral Letter*, to confound the Councils of our Enemies, and to ſtrengthen the Hands of the Friends to *England*. *Hinc illæ Lacrymæ!* Hence this appeal to § *Moderation*; which, by fatal Experience, we *Proteſtants* would have no reaſon to expect from the *Clergy* of the Church of *Rome*, if ever Power ſhould light into their Hands. Far be it from any *Proteſtant* to deſire a Retaliation, or to recommend Perſecution upon any pretence whatſoever, for the Good or Support of Religion. *Truth* is never alarmed at a fair, & an open Debate; and if the *State* could but be ſecured againſt the Intrigues and Policies of the *Court* of *Rome*, the Biſhop would be under no apprehenſions from the growing Power of the *Church* of *Rome*; and owns that he ſhould be well pleaſed with the ‡ *Plauſible* Declarations of *Loyalty*, which this Author has thought proper to make, if there was a Poſſibility of their being *Sincere*. But he apprehends it to be inconſiſtent with the Principles of any one, who is a Zealous Member of the *Church* of *Rome*, and acknowledges the *Supremacy of the Pope*, not to think the preſent Conſtitution of our Government an Uſurpation on the Power of the *Pope*; and not to be more inclined to wiſh well to the *Pretender*, than to the *Proteſtant* Succeſſion in the Houſe of *Hanover*.

* P. 30. § P. 29. ‡ P. 30-31.

FINIS.

BRITISH
12 OCT 76
MUSEUM